

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21-27, 29-37, 40, 42-45, 47-53, 55-63, 66, 68-71, 73-78, and 101-104 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-45, 47, 48, 53, 55-63, 66, and 68-71, 73, 74 are under consideration. Claims 23-26, 49-52, 75-78, and 101-104 are withdrawn. Reconsideration is requested based on the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, were disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive.

The final Office Action asserts in section 4, in the second full paragraph at page 8, that:

In response to A) The examiner didn't find support for this claim limitation in the instant specification. Therefore, the claim is rejected under 112 1st paragraph. The examiner is not considering it at this time.

This is submitted to be incorrect. Under the provisions of MPEP §2143.03, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested. As provided therein:

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Support for the recitation "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," in any case, is shown in Figs. 1, 3, 4, and 5, recited in claims 8 and 12 as filed originally, and described at page 15, lines 8-19 of the specification:

Moreover, the Web server 1 sends a test mail for checking the validity of the mail address of the forward destination that is set in the Web page described above (the CPU and the LAN board of the Web server 1 providing this function correspond to a transmission unit). Further, the Web server 1 provides the user with information representing response steps for responding to the test mail. This item of information is described by HTML (HyperText Markup Language) and stored on the unillustrated hard disk (the CPU and the hard disk of the Web server 1 executing this process correspond to an information providing unit).

Claim 8 as filed originally recites:

8. An E-mail management system according to claim 4, wherein said forward

destination registering unit registers a forward destination address unconditionally in response to said setting request for setting the forward destination address that is within a predetermined range, and registers a forward destination address with respect to which the confirmation by said confirming unit proved successful in response to said setting request for setting the forward destination address that is beyond the predetermined range.

Claim 12 as filed originally recites:

12. An E-mail management system according to claim 1, further comprising an information providing unit disclosing a step of the response to a test mail, to a user who is within a predetermined range, wherein said confirming unit confirms whether or not the response conforms with the response step.

Consequently, since "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range" is supported by the specification, it ought to be given consideration.

The final Office Action goes on to assert in section 4, in the fourth full paragraph at page 8, that:

In response to B) The applicant is reminded that claim limitation must be given their reasonable broadest interpretation.

This is submitted to be incorrect. Under the provisions of M.P.E.P. §2111, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the *specification* during patent examination, not simply their reasonable broadest interpretation. As provided therein:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Since, under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims consistent with the *specification*, neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," claim 1, for example, is submitted to be allowable.

Under the further provisions of M.P.E.P. §2111, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must *also* be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the *art* would reach, not simply the *broadest* interpretation. As provided therein:

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must also be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Since, under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach, neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," claim 1, for example, is submitted to be allowable.

Finally, the final Office Action asserts in section 4, also in the fourth full paragraph at page 8, that:

Kubik teaches validating or testing a destination or recipient address prior to sending a message. In order to test the address, existing header is extended to include a test header. The test header allows a sender to test an e-mail address without sending the message. Therefore, Kubik's teaching updating header by including test header to test address without sending message meets the claim limitation.

Neither validating or testing a destination or recipient address prior to sending a message, extending an existing header to include a test header, nor allowing a sender to test an e-mail address without sending a message, however, amounts to "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address" as recited in, for example, claim 1.

Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-48, 53, 55-63, 66 and 68-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Support for the recitation "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range" is shown in Figs. 1, 3, 4, and 5, recited in claims 8 and 12 as filed originally, and described at page 15, lines 8-19 of the specification. Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-48, 53, 55-63, 66 and

68-74 are thus submitted to comply with the written description requirement within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-48, 53, 55-63, 66, and 68-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,775,691 to Kubik et al. (hereinafter "Kubik") in view of US Patent No. 6,557,045 to Tsukui et al. (hereinafter "Tsukai"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The third and the last clauses of claim 1 recite:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.
Wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1. The final Office Action asserts in section 3, at page 3, that Kubik describes showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a destination, to a user at column 7, lines 52-55. This is submitted to be incorrect. In Kubik, rather, the e-mail address is stored in a valid e-mail address database 650 when the dead e-mail address locator program receives information indicating that an address is valid. In particular, as described at column 7, lines 52-55:

When the dead e-mail address locator program receives information indicating that an address is valid, the e-mail address is stored in a valid e-mail address database 650.

Since the e-mail address in Kubik is stored in a valid e-mail address database 650 when the dead e-mail address locator program receives information indicating that an address is valid, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

Kubik, moreover, is discovering dead e-mail addresses *without* forwarding messages to

valid recipients, rather than receiving a response to a test e-mail, let alone "disclosing a response step to a test mail, to a user who is within a predetermined range" as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described in the Abstract:

A dead e-mail identification locator discovers dead e-mail addresses without forwarding messages to valid recipients. Existing headers in the mail protocol are extended to include a test header.

Since Kubik is discovering dead e-mail addresses without forwarding messages to valid recipients, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

The mail server in Kubik, moreover, sends a reply if the address does *not* exist and may discard the message if the address does exist. In particular, as described further in the Abstract:

A mail server that supports the protocol extension of the present invention may send a reply if the address does not exist and may discard the message if the address does exist.

Since the mail server in Kubik sends a reply if the address does not exist and may discard the message if the address does exist, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

The sender in Kubik, moreover, tests an e-mail address for validity without the message being forwarded to the user, rather than "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation" as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described further in the Abstract:

The test header allows a sender to test an e-mail address for validity without the message being forwarded to the user, as will be described below. The sender may be a dead e-mail locator program, which tests a plurality of e-mail addresses, such as an e-mail address list or white pages of e-mail addresses.

Since the sender in Kubik tests an e-mail address for validity without the message being forwarded to the user, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said

confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

The dead e-mail address locator of Kubik, moreover, resides in a client. In particular, as described at column 7, lines 66 and 67, continuing at column 8, lines 1-6:

In the depicted example, the dead e-mail address locator resides in a client, such as client 510 in FIG. 5. However, a person of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the dead e-mail address locator may have other configurations. For example, the dead e-mail address locator may be embodied in a server, such as server 530 in FIG. 5. The dead e-mail address locator may also be embodied in a stand-alone system for off-line processing.

Since the dead e-mail address locator of Kubik resides in a client, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

The dead e-mail address locator of Kubik, finally, uses the results to update databases. In particular, as described at column 8, lines 25-29:

The dead e-mail address locator program may use the results to update the databases. In these examples, the dead e-mail address locator may not include a database of e-mail addresses to be tested.

Since the dead e-mail address locator of Kubik uses the results to update databases, Kubik is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as recited in claim 1.

Tsukai is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation" either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Kubik with respect to claim 1. Tsukai, rather, provides an e-mail apparatus which can easily input an e-mail address and which has good usability. In particular, as described at column 1, lines 39, 40, and 41:

An object of the present invention is to provide an e-mail apparatus, which can easily input an e-mail address and which has a good usability.

The e-mail address *itself* in Tsukai, moreover, is *divided* in a predetermined range and

stored, not "a user who is within a predetermined range" as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at column 6, lines 55-60:

Thus, the e-mail address is divided in a predetermined range and stored. By use of this point, the e-mail address is divided into the top domain name and sub-domain names and these names can be sequentially selected. This makes it possible to input the e-mail address easier and faster than the direct input.

Since the e-mail address in Tsukai is divided in a predetermined range and stored, Tsukai is not "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation" either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Kubik with respect to claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 1 would not result.

The second clause of claim 1 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as recited in claim 1. The message in Kubik, rather, is *not* to be forwarded to the owner of the e-mail identification. In particular, as described at column 1, lines 55-59:

The present invention enables servers to send dummy e-mail messages to one another in order to receive status of e-mail identifications. The protocol layer is extended to include a user field to indicate that the message is not to be forwarded to the owner of the e-mail identification.

Since, in Kubik, the message is not to be forwarded to the owner of the e-mail identification, Kubik is not "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as recited in claim 1.

The test header of Kubik, moreover, allows a sender to test an e-mail address for validity *without* the message being forwarded to the user. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 33, 34, and 35:

The test header allows a sender to test an e-mail address for validity without the message being forwarded to the user, as will be described below.

Since the test header of Kubik allows a sender to test an e-mail address for validity without the message being forwarded to the user, Kubik is not "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as recited in claim 1.

Tsukai is not "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address" either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Kubik with respect to claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 1 would not result.

The fourth clause of claim 1 recites:

Executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address and receiving the response to the test mail.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address and receiving the response to the test mail," as recited in claim 1. The message in Kubik, rather, is *not* to be forwarded to the owner of the e-mail identification, as discussed above.

Tsukai is not "executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address and receiving the response to the test mail" either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Kubik with respect to claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 1 would not result. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 3-11 and 21 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 3-11 and 21 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-11 and 21 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 14, 16-19, and 22:

The second clause of claim 14 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 14 recites:

Issuing to a mail server, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "issuing to a mail server, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The third and the last clauses of claim 14 recite:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.
Wherein the confirming includes sending the test mail and making a validity of the forward destination address confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the response conforms with the designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein the confirming includes sending the test mail and making a validity of the forward destination address confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the response conforms with the designation," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 14 would not result. Claim 14 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 16-19 and 22 depend from claim 14 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 16-19 and 22 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-19 and 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 27, 29-37, and 47:

The second clause of claim 27 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 27 recites:

Executing, using a processor, a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address and receiving the response to the test mail.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "executing, using a processor, a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address and receiving the response to the test mail," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The third and the last clauses of claim 27 recite:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.
Wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the designation," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 27 would not result. Claim 27 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons

discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 29-37 and 47 depend from claim 27 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 29-37 and 47 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29-37 and 47 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 40, 42-45 and 48:

The second clause of claim 40 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 40 recites:

Issuing to a mail server, using a processor, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "issuing to a mail server, using a processor, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The third and the last clauses of claim 40 recite:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.

Wherein a validity of the forward destination address is confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the response conforms with the designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein a validity of the forward destination address is confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the

response conforms with the designation," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 40 would not result. Claim 40 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 40 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 42-45 and 48 depend from claim 40 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 42-45 and 48 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-45 and 48 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 53, 55-63, and 73:

The second clause of claim 53 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 53 recites:

Executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "executing a confirmation of a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded, by sending the test mail to the forward destination address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The third and the last clauses of claim 53 recite:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.
Wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the response step designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range," "wherein said confirmation includes confirming whether or not the response conforms with the response step designation," as discussed above with respect to the

rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 53 would not result. Claim 53 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 53 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 55-63 and 73 depend from claim 53 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 55-63 and 73 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 55-63 and 73 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 66, 68-71, and 74:

The second clause of claim 66 recites:

Accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "accepting a setting request of a forward destination address corresponding to a receipt address of an E-mail addressed to the receipt address and the E-mail being to be forwarded to the forward destination address," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 66 recites:

Issuing to a mail server, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "issuing to a mail server, a command of confirming a validity of the forward destination address to which the E-mail addressed to the receipt address is forwarded," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The third and the last of claim 66 recites:

Showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a predetermined range.
Wherein a validity of the forward destination address is confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the response conforms with the designation.

Neither Kubik nor Tsukai teaches, discloses, or suggests "showing a responding procedure of how to respond to a test mail according to a designation, to a user who is within a

Application Serial No. 10/656,194
Response filed October 1, 2010
Reply to Final Office Action mailed July 2, 2010

predetermined range," "wherein a validity of the forward destination address is confirmed by the response to the test mail, to said mail server from the receipt address, by checking whether the response conforms with the designation," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Kubik and Tsukai were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, claim 66 would not result. Claim 66 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 66 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 68-71 and 74 depend from claim 66 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 68-71 and 74 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 68-71 and 74 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-45, 47, 48, 53, 55-63, 66, and 68-71, 73, 74 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1, 3-11, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-45, 47, 48, 53, 55-63, 66, and 68-71, 73, 74 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 1, 2010

By: /Thomas E McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501